



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.             | CONFIRMATION NO.            |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/720,661  | 11/24/2003         | Craig L. Reding      | 03-1012                         | 6212                        |
| 25537<br>VERIZON<br>PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP<br>1320 North Court House Road<br>9th Floor<br>ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909 | 7590<br>02/22/2010 |                      | EXAMINER<br>NGUYEN, QUYNH H     |                             |
|   |                    |                      | ART UNIT<br>2614                | PAPER NUMBER                |
|   |                    |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE<br>02/22/2010 | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/720,661

**Applicant(s)**

REDING ET AL.

**Examiner**

QUYNH H. NGUYEN

**Art Unit**

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE and amendment filed 1/4/10.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13, 15-41, 44-53, 55-80 and 82-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13, 15-41, 44-53, 55-80 and 82-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's RCE and amendment filed 1/4/10 has been entered. Claims 1, 4, 9-13, 15-16, 22, 28, 30, 32-33, 38-41, 44, 49-53, 55-56, 62, 68, 70, 72-73, 78-80, and 82-86 have been amended. Claims 14, 54, 81, and 86-90 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 1, 4-13, 15-41, 44-53, 55-80, and 82-86 are still pending, with claims 1, 33, 39-41, 73, and 79-86 are being independent.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. Claims 1, 4-11, 16, 26-27, 41, 44-51, 56, 66-67, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata et al. (US Patent 6,798,753) in view of Klein (US Patent 6,690,672).

As to claims 1, 41, 86, and 90, Doganata teaches a method for providing a conference call comprising:

creating, by a subscriber user on a user terminal (Fig. 2, *item 20*), a conference call event in a calendar application (col. 2, lines 41-50; col. 3, lines 42-46; col. 4, lines 16-22 and lines 28-31);

automatically configuring a conference call based on the detected conference call event (col. 2, lines 56-67) at the scheduled timer (col. 2, lines 56-67 - *where Doganata discussed once a teleconference calendar is created, at the scheduled time, the desk top application reminds users the time of the conference, and establishing the conference*);

identifying, without user intervention (col. 2, lines 8-11 and lines 56-58; col. 3, lines 3-5 - *where Doganata discussed calendar applications start teleconference automatically without any operator intervention, and the process for establishing the conference start and proceeds automatically including authenticating users id and sending telephone numbers of the participants to be dialed, hence identifying participants associated with the conference call automatically by calendar applications without user intervention*), participant users associated with the conference call event (Fig. 5, items 522 and 564; col. 6, lines 39-44 - *where Doganata discussed authenticating users id and the Platform Independent Secondary Application 34 sends the telephone number of the participants to be dialed, hence identifying participants associated with the conference call*);

notifying the subscriber user that the conference call has been configured (col. 5, lines 22-28 - *informing participants that the conference call has been configured with the time, date, dial-in number, etc*);

contacting the participant users at the time and date of the conference call event (col. 3, lines 3-5; col. 6, lines 44-46);

receiving a response from the participant users accepting or declining the conference call (col. 3, lines 5-6; col. 5, lines 28-29; col. 6, line 47); and

establishing a conference call among the participant the accepting users and the subscriber user based on the received responses (col. 3, lines 5-7; col. 5, lines 33-35; col. 6, lines 47-49).

Doganata does not explicitly suggest providing users with one or more options for declining the conference call, the options identifying alternatives for communication between the subscriber user and the declining participant users; and receiving, from the declining participant users, selections of one or more of the options for declining the conference call.

Klein teaches providing users with one or more options for declining the conference call, the options identifying alternatives for communication between the subscriber user and the declining participant users (col. 5, line 62 through col. 6, line 6); and receiving, from the declining participant users, selections of one or more of the options for declining the conference call (col. 5, line 62 through col. 6, line 6 - *where Klein discussed menus and other user interface mechanism for gathering information from the declined caller*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Klein into the teachings of Doganata for the purpose of improving conference call establishment services to improve the efficiency of conference calls, and allowing a participant who is unable to participate the conference call with options such as leaving message, redirecting the call, etc.

As to claims 4 and 44, Doganata teaches the conference call event is a trigger indicating a proposed conference call (col. 2, lines 56-67).

As to claims 5-6 and 45-46, Doganata teaches collecting an identifier for the participant users from corresponding to the conference call event and collecting contact information for the participants users based on the participant user identifiers (col. 2, lines 52-56 - *telephone numbers of the participants, account id, etc.*).

As to claims 7, 47, Doganata teaches collecting contact information associated with the participant users (col. 2, lines 53-56); and establishing a communication connection with the participant users using the contact information (col. 3, lines 3-7; col. 6, lines 42-46).

As to claims 8, 48, Doganata teaches dialing out to participant users using a respective telephone number (col. 6, lines 42-46).

As to claims 9 and 49, Doganata teaches contacting the participant users includes calling the participant users using a telephone number and receiving a response from the participant users includes: for a participant user providing an indication to the subscriber reflecting whether the participant answers the call (col. 6, lines 44-50).

As to claims 10-11 and 50-51, Doganata and Klein do not teach providing no contact message to the subscriber when the participant does not answer the call and providing no conference call message to the subscriber when none of the participant answer calls. It would have been obvious that if participant / none of participants

response, then there is no information to provide to the coordinator, and if there is no participants replied to invitations then there is not conference at all.

As to claims 15 and 55, Klein teaches if the destination caller declined the call, the options such as leaving a message, call redirection, and information presentation, and numerous options are extensible as would be understood by one skilled in the art (col. 5, lines 62-67) reads on the options for the declining participant include: allowing the users to record messages for play back to the subscriber, to set alternate telephone numbers for contacting the users and allowing the users to set periods of time in which the users are to be contacted again.

As to claims 16 and 56, Doganata teaches establishing a communication connection between participant and the subscriber such that the subscriber and the participant may conduct a conference call (col. 6, lines 47-49 - *where Doganata discussed adding participants that answer the phone to the conference bridge, hence participant and subscriber user can conduct a conference call via conference bridge*).

As to claims 26-27 and 66-67, Doganata teaches the subscriber configures the conference call by scheduling the conference call in a calendar application for a predetermined date and time (col. 2, lines 51-56 and lines 58-67) and adding participants that the subscriber intends to participate in the conference call (col. 3, lines 3-7).

4. Claims 12-13, 22-25, 33-37, 52-53, 62-65, 73-77, and 82-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata and Klein in view of Malik (US Patent 6,801,610).

As to claims 12 and 52, Doganata and Klein do not teach providing an acceptance message to the subscriber when the participant answers the call.

Malik teaches providing an acceptance message to the subscriber when the participant answers the call (col. 5, lines 55-58 - *where Malik discussed providing a termination notification, for example, notification messages*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Malik into the teaching of Doganata and Klein for the purpose of having a more efficient and user-friendly system, and notifying subscriber as participant answers the call in order for the subscriber conference the participant in so that the conference can start on time.

As to claims 13 and 53, Doganata teaches determining whether the participant accepts the call (col. 6, lines 47-49).

As to claims 22 and 62, Malik teaches determining whether a participant user has a preferred device and contacting a participant user through the preferred device when the participant user has a preferred device (col. 2, lines 25-30 - *where Malik discussed receiving information regarding one or more telephone numbers for each participant, hence it is inherent that the telephone number is the number of participant's preferred device that the participant provided*).



As to claims 23-24 and 63-64, Malik teaches generating a CreateCall function telephone conference information and how to configure the conference call; generating instructions for setting up the conference call and the telephone numbers (col. 5, lines 47-58). Malik does not explicitly teach generating a first message and a second message based on the first message. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Doganata's conference system to have additional steps of generating messages for the same purpose of scheduling, configuring, and setting up conferences.

As to claims 25 and 65, Doganata teaches calling the participants using the telephone number (col. 6, lines 44-47).

Claims 33 and 73 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Doganata teaches user input necessary information for establishing the conference call: telephone numbers of the participants, account id, etc. (col. 2, lines 41-56). Doganata does not explicitly teach providing a message including the contact information to a conference server that is configured to instruct a conference bridge to establish the conference call between the users by calling the participants using the contact information included in the message; and receiving a response message from the conference server including information associated with the conference call and at least one participant.

Malik teaches collecting contact information for the participants (col. 2, lines 28-32); providing a message including the contact information to a conference server that is configured to instruct a conference bridge to establish the conference call between

the users by calling the participants using the contact information included in the message; and receiving a response message from the conference server including information associated with the conference call and at least one participant (col. 2, lines 11-35; col. 4, line 37 through col. 5, line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Malik into the teachings of Doganata for the purpose of having a more efficient and user-friendly system, and assisting conference server to setup and establishing calls with participants in a timely manner.

As to claims 34 and 74, Doganata teaches scanning a calendar application associated with the subscriber user for the conference call event (col. 4, lines 32-35 - *where Doganata discussed the conference information entered by users is read by Calendar View Process 24 and processed*).

Claims 35 and 75 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 6-7.

Claims 36 and 76 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 33.

As to claims 37 and 77, Malik teaches providing the response message when attempting to establish communications with the participant over a voice network (col. 6, lines 6-14 col. 5, lines 55-58 - *where Malik discussed providing a termination notification/message*).

Claims 82-83 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 33, respectively. Furthermore, Doganata teaches a computer readable medium including instructions for performing when executed by a processor (col. 3, lines 38-50); and Malik teaches a computer readable medium including instructions for performing when executed by a processor (col. 3, line 25 through col. 5, line 3).

5. Claims 17 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata and Klein in view of Herr et al. (US Patent 4,540,850).

As to claims 17 and 57, Doganata does not teach detecting when one of the participants terminates its contact during the conference call; providing a termination message to the subscriber indicating that the participant has ended participation in the conference call.

Herr teaches detecting when one of the participants terminates its contact during the conference call; providing a termination message to the subscriber indicating that the participant has ended participation in the conference call (col. 1, lines 52-54; col. 19, lines 21-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Herr into the teachings of Doganata for the purpose of having a more efficient system by informing the conference originator or subscriber about the termination participant in order to give the subscriber opportunity to reestablish a connection to the participant if it was an inadvertently terminated.

6. Claims 18-21 and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata and Klein in view of Kermani (US Patent 6,697,796).

As to claims 18 and 58, Doganata does not teach recording audio information, converting at least some of the audio information to text information, and recording the text information in a transcript reflecting a textual temporal based representation of communications that have taken place between users.

Kermani teaches recording audio information between users (col. 2, lines 9-12), converting at least some of the audio information to text information (Fig. 3, 102), and recording the text information in a transcript reflecting a textual temporal based representation of communications that have taken place between users (col. 3, lines 30-33; col. 4, lines 25-30; col. 5, lines 44-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Kermani into the teachings of Doganata for the purpose of later playing back to users when certain important information need to be reviewed.

As to claims 19 and 59, Kermani teaches particular textual string are located, the particular audio segments recorded may be played or accessed in whole or in relevant part (col. 4, lines 34-37). Hence, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that if portion of relevant part recorded and played and there are still other portions of audio segments stored in database or transcript (col. 4, lines 40-43).

As to claims 20-21 and 60-61, Doganata and Kermani do not teach providing the transcript to the subscriber including attaching the transcript to an e-mail addressed to the subscriber. Attaching a file and sending to users via e-mail is well known and the advantage of using it is also well known. For example, if receiver needs to edit the file for some minor changes.

7. Claims 28-32 and 68-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata and Klein in view of Chakrabarti et al. (US Patent 6,163,692).

As to claims 28-29 and 68-69, Doganata does not teach detecting when a participant was dropped from the conference and determining whether the participant has a preferred device registered, attempting to contact the participant through the preferred device.

Chakrabarti teaches detecting when a participant was dropped from the conference and attempting to contact the participant through a device (col. 3, lines 4-16). Chakrabarti further teaches users device's is mobile devices, and the participant has a registered preferred device (col. 13, line 67 through col. 14, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Chakrabarti into the teachings of Doganata for the purpose of have a more efficient system and allowing participants to rejoin the conference after a lost connection due to any reasons without having to redial the conference number again.

As to claims 30 and 70, Chakrabarti teaches re-establishing the user with the conference call based on a determination that the user wished to continue participation in the conference call (col. 3, lines 16-24 - *where Chakrabarti discussed automatically re-establish connection in response to detection of an unintentional disconnection, therefore the user wished to continue participate in the conference since it was a unintentionally disconnection*).

As to claims 31 and 71, Chakrabarti teaches determining contact information associated with a device used by the participant to participate in the conference call; and re-establishing the user with the conference call using the contact information (col. 3, line 10 through col. 4, line 4).

As to claims 32 and 72, Chakrabarti teaches detecting when a participant has terminated participation in the conference call; and determining whether the participant voluntarily or involuntarily terminated participation in the conference call based on the type of device the participant was operating during participation in the conference call (col. 3, line 10 through col. 4, line 4).

8. Claims 38, 40, 78, 80-81, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata, Klein, and Malik in view of Gottlieb et al. (US Patent 5,638,434).

As to claims 38 and 78, Doganata, Klein, and Malik do not teach the response comprises at least one of: information stating that at least one participant is declining the call; information stating that at least one participant is accepting the call.

Gottlieb teaches the response comprises at least one of: information stating that at least one participant is not answering the call; information stating that at least one participant is accepting the call (col. 6, lines 32-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Gottlieb into the teachings of Doganata and Malik for the purpose of allowing the conference operator to proceed dialing the next participant if the dialed participant does not answering the call or marking the conference port as occupied if the participant accept the call.

Claims 40, 80, and 85 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 33, and 38. Furthermore, Doganata teaches invoking by the users a desktop application via calendar view user interface and calendar view process (Fig. 2, items 22 and 24) to provide information necessary for establishing the conference (col. 2, lines 41-44), and automatically invoking a secondary application to establish the conference (col. 2, lines 56-67) via secondary application interface (Fig. 2, item 32).

Claim 81 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 80. Furthermore, Wu teaches a conference bridge for receiving messages, extracting the phone numbers from the message and calling the participants using the phone numbers, and establishing a conference call between the participants and the subscriber (col. 8, lines 4-23), wherein the users schedule conference calls for future dates and automatically attempt to establish the conference calls when the future dates arrive (col. 3, lines 13-26).

9. Claims 39, 79, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata, Klein, Malik, Chakrabarti, and Gottlieb and further in view of Henrikson et al. (2003/0053612).

As to claims 39 and 79 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 28, 30, 33, and 38. Henrikson teaches determining if a current time and data is within a predetermined window before a time and date of the conference call event ([0033] - *where Henrikson discussed determining the conference time approaches, for example five minutes prior to a schedule conference call*); and configuring a conference call based on the determining that the current time and date is within the predetermined window ([0032], [0033] - *where Henrikson discussed prior to the scheduled conference call, the conference establishment server does a preliminary check on the availability of participants and resources for configuring the conference, for example, configuring conference bridge circuit, determining if bandwidth is available for communications with a user terminal, etc.*); and it would have been obvious that after the scheduled time, the conference start, the server dial out to participants to join the conference, then the participants can either join or decline to join the conference, and there is no otherwise.

Claim 84 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 39. Furthermore, Doganata teaches a computer readable medium including instructions for performing when executed by a processor (col. 3, lines 38-50); and



Malik teaches a computer readable medium including instructions for performing when executed by a processor (col. 3, line 25 through col. 5, line 3).

***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-13, 15-41, 44-53, 55-80, and 82-86 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to QUYNH H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number:

10/720,661

Art Unit: 2614

Page 17

/Quynh H Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614